

ARIZONA STATE PARKS BOARD
1300 W. WASHINGTON STREET, PHOENIX, AZ
JANUARY 19, 2006
MINUTES

Board Members Present

Elizabeth Stewart
William Porter
William Cordasco
Janice Chilton
William Scalzo
John Hays
Mark Winkleman (arrived at 10:55 a.m.)

Staff Present

Kenneth E. Travous, Executive Director
Jay Ream, Assistant Director, Parks
Jay Ziemann, Assistant Director, Partnerships and External Affairs
Mark Siegwarth, Assistant Director, Administration
Cristie Statler, Executive Consultant
Debi Busser, Executive Secretary
Dan Shein, Chief, Resources Management

Attorney General's Office

Joy Hernbrode, Assistant Attorney General

A. CALL TO ORDER – ROLL

Chairman Stewart called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. Roll Call indicated a quorum was present.

B. INTRODUCTIONS OF BOARD MEMBERS AND AGENCY STAFF

The Parks Board and agency staff introduced themselves.

Chairman Stewart then moved to Agenda Item D.

D. DISCUSSION ITEMS

- 1. Discussion with Representatives of Game and Fish Commission on Items of Mutual Concern and the How Each Agency Can Assist the Other.** Items to be discussed may include the Heritage Fund, cooperative management of properties, watchable wildlife and other educational programs.

Chairman Stewart stated that Mr. Hayes Gilstrap, Chairman of the Arizona Game and Fish Commission and Mr. Duane Shrouf, Director of the Arizona Game and Fish Commission (G&F) to join the Parks Board. She noted that a few years ago the Board and Commission held a joint meeting and discussed some mutual issues of concern. Sometimes it is difficult to get a quorum for a separate meeting. In looking at the schedules for the two entities this year it appeared that the best thing to do this year was to invite a delegation from G&F to join the Board and perhaps later in the year the Board could send a delegation to one of their meetings.

Chairman Stewart noted that during the past year the Board entered into a cooperative agreement with the Coal Mine Springs property; there has been involvement in

watchable wildlife with G&F. It appears there are a number of things that there may be cooperation regarding management of properties and educational activities. She felt it would be good to spend some time on throwing out ideas and discussing possible areas that the two entities can work on in the future.

Chairman Stewart invited Mr. Gilstrap to join the Board since Mr. Winkleman had to leave for another commitment. Mr. Shrouf joined the Executive Staff.

Mr. Gilstrap thanked the Board for inviting them. He noted that Mr. Shrouf would interject as the discussion progressed. He stated that he believed the meeting that was held a few years ago was very good. He suggested that in the future it might be a good idea to agenda a collective meeting in the course of their regular schedules and do it annually. He suggested that the Commission and Board may want to schedule half a day together and then go into their own agendas for the other half of the day.

Mr. Gilstrap stated that there is a great deal of overlap – and it's a good overlap. Coal Mine Springs is still in the process. That particular project is very intriguing because he has the pleasure of serving on the Board of the Trust for Public Land as well. He believes they are currently awaiting clarification on some appraisals in order to take the next step in expansion. Watchable wildlife is an area that is a reality and has some potential serious problems of hurting their habitat landscape.

Mr. Porter asked if there is any methodology in place for staff contact that would make it easier for the two entities to identify areas where there may be overlap.

Chairman Stewart responded that there are some parks that are G&F land.

Mr. Porter responded that he was aware of that; he wondered if there is any kind of liaison that really goes on where staffs have regular contact.

Mr. Travous responded that he has known Mr. Shrouf for 20 years. Mr. Shrouf came on as Director of G&F shortly after he became Director of Arizona State Parks (ASP). He recalled coming back from Flagstaff some time ago and people were talking about this thing called the Heritage Fund. He and Mr. Shrouf have been asked to speak about what the Heritage Fund meant. On the way back they both remarked that if the Heritage Fund goes through there will, at some point in time, be a quarter of a billion dollars coming into Arizona for the conservation of Arizona's resources. That point has been hit. Beyond that, there are committees (Natural Areas) that almost always have someone from G&F. When the Natural Areas program conducts studies, G&F is always invited to share their expertise. They have the databases for the natural resources regarding wildlife. He believes there is mutual respect and a nice working relationship between the two agencies.

Mr. Porter noted that in the balkanization that occurs in Arizona there are entities that have so much in common that are all government agencies. Entities who should be talking and closely coordinating sometimes are not. They may have a friendly relationship, but they really don't communicate on a level to where they really aren't cognizant of what the other is really doing or where there may be some overlap where there could be some commonality. With the scarcity of resources, tight budgets, etc., he believes that it is more vital than ever that the agencies cooperate.

Mr. Travous added that the Governor also has the Natural Resources Cabinet. This group meets on a monthly basis and includes (in addition to ASP and G&F) the heads

of the Department of Environmental Quality, Water Resources, and Agriculture to discuss agency agendas and issues. There is coordination at the state level as well.

Mr. Shrouf stated that he is a statutory member of AORCC. He sees Mr. Travous regularly; and, of course, they talk about a lot of issues that come before the Board for approval. Additionally, there is also a State Leadership Committee made up of himself, Mr. Travous, the Natural Resources Cabinet, the Regional Forest Director, the EPA – all the leaders who make decisions and have authority over natural resources in Arizona. This group meets three times a year. They work in coordination with ASP in training programs for enforcement. They have more enforcement officers in the field than ASP. They have classes that come out of the certification schools three times a year; they have post certification classes and invite ASP to participate. All of their officers have to go through a minimum number of hours of advanced training yearly and ASP is invited to participate.

Mr. Shrouf stated that, not only at his and Mr. Travous' level, there is a lot of coordination occurring between the Deputy Directors, the Assistant Directors, and even the field staff. Projects such as Coal Mine Springs and natural preserve areas exemplify where coordination of issues on the ground occurs. G&F could have managed Coal Mine Springs, but it wasn't feasible for them to do so. ASP is right next door. They think it's a very good purchase and G&F will try to expand it. He believes the two agencies are working quite closely.

Mr. Shrouf added that there is one very important facet for both agencies – the Heritage Fund. They have worked very closely with ASP for 13-14 years. There is a lot of work going on. When Chairman Stewart called and wanted to get together, it was hard for them to get their Commission together and the Board to get their members together to merge it at the last minute. He will work with Mr. Travous on bringing to the Board the joint projects the agencies have worked on and will work on.

Mr. Porter stated that he really did not doubt the two agencies were working together. He noted that it's been a couple of years since he's heard much about it and wanted to get the feel for what is being done jointly.

Mr. Travous noted that both he and Mr. Shrouf are members of the Advisory Committee for the College of Natural Resources at the University of Arizona. They probably bump into each other more than they like.

Mr. Travous added that, having been in two other states where G&F and the Parks Department are part of a Natural Resources Department, he would submit that AZ G&F and ASP have a better relationship on the ground than Utah and Tennessee. He believes that credit, by-and-large, belongs to G&F and Mr. Shrouf. Mr. Shrouf is a different kind of leader when it comes to that ilk and he has always been inclusive. The preponderance of the relationship comes from Mr. Shrouf. He respects Mr. Shrouf.

Mr. Porter stated that he likes the concept just broached that there be another meeting of some kind with a good briefing on the joint projects. He asked whether Tam O'Shanter is something G&F has or should have a role in.

Mr. Ream responded that staff will probably be doing significant environmental studies at Tam O'Shanter before it can become a park and before staff can even process the R&PP application with the BLM. Currently, habitat studies at San Rafael for environmental studies on the Conservation Easement are contracted through G&F. He

suspects that staff will probably do some environmental studies at Tam O'Shanter through G&F as well. It is a significant tortoise habitat; staff will be working with their habitat staff and non-game staff as well.

Chairman Stewart noted that the Verde Valley Greenway is probably the top of this Board's projects in terms of future acquisitions. She asked whether there's been involvement with G&F in that project or whether there is a role for them there.

Mr. Ream responded that there is through the Verde Birding Festival and the work in the non-game areas. He added that there is significant contact with G&F at the Dead Horse Ranch State Park where staff rely on the stocking of trout. The Verde River could certainly be a fishery; it certainly has a great many opportunities as the Board continues to purchase down to the Greenway that this Board has supported. It is important to continue working with G&F and provide opportunities at all of ASP's venues.

Mr. Scalzo noted that he had the privilege of serving with both Mr. Shrouf and Mr. Travous on the AORCC Board for several years. They do work closely together; they know what the other is doing. He added that G&F just won the Arizona Quality Alliance Award for the Pioneer Division, the next highest top award given in the state. It is equivalent to winning the Baldrige Award. It is because of the professionalism they demonstrate and the quality of work they perform. They are a great partner. The County works closely with these agencies. They have been very supportive in the area of grants. He believes the Board should realize that both ASP and G&F have been considered good partners in the County level and in many other levels in the state. They are perceived as high-quality, effective management groups that they all like to work with.

Chairman Stewart stated that is why the Board wanted the meeting – to see if there are additional projects that they might partner on. Obviously, the Board is concerned about protecting the Heritage Fund at this time of year. She doesn't know if anyone has thought of something else that the Board might work on.

Mr. Travous suggested another thing the two agencies will have to deal with is the explosive growth in Arizona. After he and Mr. Shrouf have a chance to sit down and talk about it, he suggested perhaps it is in order to have a future conservation agenda for the state of Arizona that would bring in the historic preservation people, G&F staff, and others. It is getting incredibly difficult to even understand what is happening now with the leapfrogging in development on the other side of the White Tank Mountains. Pulte just announced that across the highway near Kartchner Caverns State Park (KCSP) in Benson they are putting in 4,000 homes. A good future agenda might be development's impacts on wildlife and open spaces.

Chairman Stewart suggested that that ties in with the presentation with the Phoenix Zoo. It may eventually lend itself to convening a public forum the Board sponsors or a conference to get the public more involved and concerned about what all this expansion may be doing to the wildlife resources, recreational resources, and get people to be thinking about planning. The State Trust Initiative is coming up; it may or may not go through. The Board cannot put all of its eggs into that basket. The Board needs to be proactive. It appears that both agencies have an obligation to inform the public where things appear to be going. She attended a workshop G&F sponsored where a number of managers from ASP talked about watchable wildlife and how things are changing with G&F. More and more people want to watch wildlife and it's not just the hunting

interests that they have to be concerned about. A lot of our parks are fairly small. The agency has depended on various recreational activities which may or may not be able to continue. There's an opportunity in the parks for expanding the watchable wildlife program and partnering with G&F on that program. She believes both agencies are in a position of having to rethink how services are provided to the public and how they are protecting the public's resources with things changing so fast.

Mr. Hays noted that the Board is in a position to act very quickly if something comes up that is of concern. Mr. Shrouf and Mr. Travous work beautifully together. He does not believe there is a need for committees or liaisons. All that's needed is a telephone. He believes the suggestion of getting public input to the impact of growth on wildlife and conservation is not nearly as efficient. It should perhaps come through the legislature.

Chairman Stewart noted that it appears that all of the people are moving to Arizona because of these natural resources; yet they are being gobbled up very fast.

Mr. Gilstrap stated he would say, "Yes," and "Ditto," to both statements. If these two agencies can be the conduit to start that process, then both are serving a very worthy cause. It is an issue that isn't talked about; is thought about; is worried about; and yet, we aren't even close as far as having an efficient way to communicate the issue. It will be a real challenge for both organizations. It is natural for them to need a conduit to cause it to happen and then have the appropriate steps taken through the legislature. There are some challenges out there. We are blessed with a beautiful, wonderful state that everyone wants to come visit; and they also want their section of open space.

Chairman Stewart noted that they also want to close their sections of open space off to the public.

Mr. Cordasco noted that ASP is a joy to him, and he can't say enough about G&F. He doesn't have enough knowledge about how ASP and G&F work together legislatively. He wasn't sure if the two agencies could be beneficial to each other outside of the Heritage Fund, such as on budget issues. He asked whether there is continuity there or not.

Mr. Shrouf responded that G&F is fortunate in the fact that they don't have to depend on General Fund money. While that's good in some cases, they still have to get permission from the legislature to increase their fees, licenses, and tags. They also have to go back to the legislature each year and get permission to spend that money that is dedicated to G&F. On one hand, they have a dedicated amount of money; on the other hand, it's hard for them to generate those increases and get permission to spend those increases from the legislature as it is for ASP to go down and request General Fund money. He knows that Senator Hays was involved in that for a long time in the legislature. It appears sometimes easier – sometimes harder – to use their dedicated funds than it is to get General Funds and be involved in the General Fund cut. The issues that the legislature deals with on General Fund matters are the same as the Commission and G&F have to deal with on a day-to-day basis. They can't run out of money. If their revenues are down they have to watch that balance closely. They cut their own programs. They don't have to depend on the legislature to cut them because they cut their programs themselves. They do it on a day-to-day, once-a-month basis. There are different things that will affect them. The General Fund affects ASP more than it does G&F; but the natural happenings (the drought, game populations, etc.) affect the G&F budget. They have to deal with it on a month-to-month basis with the

Commission. It seems like it's six of one and half a dozen of the other. Both types of budgets have their dangers.

Mr. Travous added that there are things that the agencies have in common such as issues relating to Off Highway Vehicles. There are staff who work together on those issues. Generally, the more we have something aligned (like when the Heritage Fund was being proposed), the more the agencies are involved on a day-to-day basis. Other than that, when there are areas that intersect the agency relies on Mr. Ziemann for legislative issues.

Mr. Ziemann noted that the General Fund Revenues are affecting ASP less and less. When it comes to meeting day-to-day and just talking, he is at the legislature every day, as is his counterpart at G&F, Mr. Guiles, is there every day as well. They don't necessarily have common bills. For example, their Fee bill that went through last year to increase their fees to increase their revenue. That does not directly affect ASP. However, he and Mr. Guiles would talk just about every day. He would ask if Mr. Ziemann had heard anything or talked to legislators or been on the floor or in committee when something was said. Mr. Ziemann would seek Mr. Guiles out and ask if he'd heard anything about bills of interest to ASP. Legislators sometimes get the two agencies confused. Both agencies deal with the same legislative staffers. At that level, they talk virtually every day of the week for six months out of the year. He added that there is OHV legislation that staff have been working on for six months that now appear to have problems. They talk about strategy on things that don't directly affect one of the agencies. He can honestly say that, from his perspective, the relationship with G&F is as close and tight as has existed in the 15-16 years he's been with ASP.

Mr. Cordasco asked whether there is opportunity to increase the original values of the Heritage Fund. So often there are people who want to start a new land trust or set up a conservation deal that protects the land. The fact is that there is no money and there is no support for the actual purchase of whatever it is. It seems that G&F and ASP, with whatever authority they have within the state, would be able to make a further effort to create that support within the general population of the state who would go to the legislature to get more financial support. It appears that there's a lot of talking that, while genuine, about wildlife and open space and recreational opportunities, all the while knowing even from the start that there's no money to do it.

Mr. Travous responded that bringing together interested groups would be a natural outcome of putting together a future meeting of the various groups for a conservation agenda. When the Heritage Fund was put together, ASP brought in the Arizona Parks and Recreation Association; they brought in the Yuma Rod and Gun Club. ASP brought in the bicycle users; they brought in the Maricopa County Varmint Callers. In the final analysis the three things that would come out would be: better coordination, better communication, and money. It's a matter of getting the critical mass together and keeping them together after the meeting is over.

Mr. Hays asked if there is any portion of the G&F budget that comes from the General Fund.

Mr. Shrouf responded negatively. They had an appropriation before he came on board 20 years ago that had to do with a General Fund appropriation to study potential future lake sites in Arizona. It was a one-time appropriation that the department used. He doesn't know of any lakes occurring because of that study. When he first came to G&F

the agency had the audacity to ask for some General Fund money and it never got to first base. It hasn't been very fruitful for them to request General Fund money.

Mr. Hays noted that G&F still has to go to the legislature and beg for the right to spend money that is not funded by the legislature from the General Fund.

Mr. Shrouf added that G&F are accused many times of being autonomous. That is one of the ways that he can remind the legislature that they control 35% of his budget.

Mr. Porter stated that he found this discussion to be very valuable. He would like to see some follow-through and planning into putting together a consortium to try to get out the information to the public. He believes that really is important. He hopes that some form of state trust land reform goes through soon, but he's not sure that it will. Whatever come of that initiative he doesn't think it will necessarily solve all our problems. He believes the Board will have to try to get the public more and more involved and educated to stand the ground that will have to be stood before it's too late and these resources will be gone. It won't be long. He sees tens of thousands of home sites in the desert area near Hoover Dam that are waterless tracts. Because they are not in the proper district, they don't have to provide water. They will be selling those home sites and people will be building with no water. This type of stupid scenario is happening all over the state. He would like to see this type of consortium pursued.

Chairman Stewart asked Mr. Shrouf, Mr. Travous, and Mr. Gilstrap if there are any specific properties that would lend themselves to joint management, other than expansion of Coal Mine Springs.

Mr. Shrouf responded that, in coordination, those issues were discussed. However, G&F is more in the cycle of buying properties that will ensure habitats for wildlife, especially since their charter and statutes in the Heritage Fund are different from ASP's. The Board has more flexibility than G&F has in buying land. They don't have as much flexibility as the Board; the lands that they are currently purchasing are being purchased for protection of habitats and species. Where coordination can best be achieved is probably from the educational aspect and working their educational programs together. They feel that when a riparian area comes up that is close to one of the Board's properties, it is wiser to have a local entity manage it as a partner for the same reasons they would manage it than to put another infrastructure in place and duplicate business. They are cognizant of that. He doesn't have anything in mind because their main acquisition is for those reasons; not for high-intensity public use.

Chairman Stewart responded that she's not sure that everything the Board does in the future will be high-intensity, either. From surveys that staff conduct around the state it appears more and more people want the open space and less-developed recreational activities and opportunities available. She believes that, as time goes on, the Board's focus may get closer to G&F's focus as well.

Mr. Porter added that what the Board has gotten into with Sonoita Creek and San Rafael are quite different types of park. He believes the agency is changing. The Board made a conscious decision two or three years ago to start looking at ourselves as a broader based entity, which makes ASP overlap even more with what G&F is about. He believes it make it more important to have the two agencies work closely together.

Mr. Scalzo noted that the Chairman raised the issue of public lands and OHV. There is another area that he believes should be in the fold – the whole area of public shooting.

It is affecting public land and some private land. G&F are known as trying to do more than create those facilities. They are trying to find the land that people will support. ASP should support it being done in a safe manner. It's not just OHV; it's also public shooting. There are county and regional parks that are running into that issue. The Board needs to address that effectively. There's been a lot of energy spent on OHV but not on public shooting ranges. G&F have effectively been a leader in that area. That may be an area the two agencies can work together on, too, in finding a combined resource to jointly sponsor it so it's done safely with guns, rifles, and even archery and so there are places for people to go that are safe and effective.

Chairman Stewart noted that that may eliminate some of the dumping on public lands as well. She's run across toilets, washing machines, etc., that people has set up as targets in the desert.

Ms. Chilton asked if the Board can give grants for public shooting ranges.

Chairman Stewart responded that it could probably be done through State Local and Regional State Parks and Land and Water Conservation Fund. It would have to be available to the public.

Mr. Hays asked if there are many shooting ranges in the state.

Mr. Shrouf responded that they are working hard in Tucson because the Tucson Rod and Gun Club range has been closed. They have one at Three Points; they have been trying for eight years to site a range in northern Arizona near Flagstaff similar in size to Ben Avery. They ended up in the Ninth Circuit Court on the last try. There is a need; everyone wants to meet that need; but it's impossible to place a range in the middle of the forest without people having problems with it. They are trying again; they are looking at five potential sites around the Flagstaff area. They have \$7 million set aside to develop that range. It will probably cost upwards of \$8-\$10 million by the time they get done. Finding the site is a big deal. They have been trying to find a site up there for 10-12 years. He added that they are working with Maricopa County near Buckeye. His vision is that in metro areas such as Phoenix there is a need for a Ben Avery sized range in the southeast, east, or northeast. They have Rio Salado, Ben Avery, are working on Buckeye, and are looking elsewhere so people don't have to drive more than a couple of hours to get to a range. Every time they get a site that's close to state land or close to somebody, they get a rash of complaints, even though these same people say we need a site. They are working very hard. They have a lot of shooting programs. They award about \$150,000 in grants to shooting clubs to improve ranges. It's a very active program that, if addressed correctly, could use millions of dollars.

Chairman Stewart noted that the Board has talked about having a joint meeting in the future between the Board and Commission, expanding the Coal Mine Springs area, working on protecting and expanding the Heritage Fund, looking at ATV lands; public shooting, educational activities, watchable wildlife, perhaps see whether there's an additional role for G&F on the Verde Greenway, and looking into convening a public forum or conference on conserving resources. She stated the Board's appreciation to Mr. Shrouf and Mr. Gilstrap attending the Board meeting today. She felt it has been productive. She suggested they may want to stay a few more minutes. Mr. Jeff Williams from the Phoenix Zoo has come and will make a brief presentation on some of the difficulties of engaging young people in nature and a program that they developed

to deal with that issue. She found that that was the single more informative and interesting presentation at the recent Arizona Conservation Summit.

Mr. Gilstrap thanked the Board for inviting them. They share both the concerns and positives on the working relationships between the agencies. The advantage of meeting together is that the Board and the Commission each has new members coming on and they can continue an ongoing relationship. It is particularly good that the staff have a quality relationship that the Board and Commission can share in.

Mr. Shrouf extended an invitation to the Board to their Meet the Commission event in the afternoon. The Commission invites the public in to just chat about issues for half a day. Then, to give something back to the public who have been supportive over the past year they have an awards banquet Saturday night in which the Commission honors certain categories of individuals who have been partnering and working side-by-side in dealing with the work for wildlife resources in the state. It is a big affair; they average about 200 attendees. The Commission presents about 15 awards. It's quite a big deal. He invited the Board to attend.

The meeting was Recessed at 10:02 a.m.

Chairman Stewart reconvened the meeting at 10:10 a.m.

C. CONSENT AGENDA - The following items of a noncontroversial nature have been grouped together for a single vote without Board discussion. The Consent Agenda is a timesaving device and Board members received documentation on these items for their review prior to the open meeting. Any Board member may remove any item from the Consent Agenda for discussion and a separate vote at this meeting as deemed necessary. The public may view the documentation relating to the Consent Agenda at the Board's office, 1300 W. Washington, Suite 104, Phoenix, Arizona.

- 1. Approve Minutes of November 17, 2005 Arizona State Parks Board Meeting**
- 2. Fee Recommendation** – Staff recommends that the Arizona State Parks Board change the off season designations at Catalina, Lost Dutchman, Oracle, Picacho Peak, Fool Hollow and Roper Lake State Parks; Eliminate the Discount season for camping at Roper Lake; reduce the camping fees for both electric and non-electric sites at Roper Lake and institute a pet fee for the cabins and yurts as presented by staff to take effect beginning March 1, 2006 and allow staff to proceed with public notification of said changes.
- 3. Concession Contract Slide Rock State Park** – Staff recommends that the Board authorize the Executive Director or his designee to enter into negotiations and a contract for concession services at Slide Rock State Park.
- 4. Consider Extending the Project End Date for Mohave County Parks Department State Lake Improvement Fund Project: 780001, Davis Camp Improvements** – Staff recommends extending the project end date by 12 months to December 18, 2006 for State Lake Improvement Fund Project #780001, Mohave County Parks Dept. – Davis Camp.
- 5. Consider Extending the Project End Date for Mohave County Parks Department State Lake Improvement Fund Projects: 789901, Davis Camp Improvements** – Staff recommends extending the project end date by 12

months to December 7, 2006 for State lake Improvement Fund Project #789901 Mohave County Parks Dept. – Davis Camp.

6. **Consider Request for Extension of the Project End Date for City of Phoenix Parks and Recreation Department Historic Preservation Fund Project #640210 Phoenix Indian School Dining Hall** – Staff recommends the approval of a one-year project end date from November 26, 2005 to November 26, 2006 to the City of Phoenix for the Historic Preservation Heritage Fund Grant #640210, Phoenix Indian School Dining Hall. HPAC unanimously approved the staff recommendation at their December 5, 2005 meeting.
7. **Consider Request for CAP Increase for Historic Preservation Grants** – Staff recommends approval of a \$50,000 cap increase from \$100,000 to \$150,000 per project beginning FY 2006 Historic Preservation grant application projects. HPAC unanimously approved the staff recommendation at their December 5, 2005 meeting.
8. **Consider Request for Modification to the Current Heritage Fund Historic Preservation Grant #640208 Historic Sites at District Park – Town of Marana** – Staff recommends: Preservation Conservation Easement Deed (PCED) boundaries be modified to include only the archaeological site and a separate easement created for the historic Aguirre Ranch building sites; Arizona State Parks will develop a modified PCED for recordation; for those archaeological features that fall outside the new PCED and inside the rights-of-way (features on the south end of trench 8 and 9), Marana will conduct the same data recovery as was done for the other sites within the right-of-way; allowing the Town of Marana to create a “Yuma Wash Archaeology Site” for public interpretation and future scientific data recovery studies; allowing the Town of Marana to create an “Aguirre Ranch Historic site” with a Ramada over the historic Aguirre Ranch building and other recommended features; the Town of Marana will nominate the Yuma Wash Archaeology Site and the Aguirre Ranch Historic Site for listing on the National Register; and that any ground-disturbing activities, even those previously approved under the current PCED, will require written SHPO approval. HPAC unanimously approved the staff recommendations at their December 5, 2005 meeting.

Chairman Stewart pulled Consent Agenda Items 2 and 8 from consideration at this time.

Mr. Hays made a motion to approve Consent Agenda Items 1, 3, 4, 5 6, and 7.

Ms. Chilton seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously (6-0).

Chairman Stewart asked if there was a motion relating to Consent Agenda Item #2.

Board Action

Mr. Porter: I move that the Arizona State Parks Board change the off season designation at Catalina, Lost Dutchman, Oracle, and Picacho Peak State Parks to the Friday before Memorial Day through the Tuesday after Labor Day, change the off-season designation at Fool Hollow Lake to October-March, eliminate the off-season discounts at Roper Lake State Park, change the camping fee for both electric and non-

electric sites at Roper Lake to \$10-\$12/night non-electric and \$16-\$20/night electric, and institute a pet fee for the cabins and yurts of an additional \$5/per night.

Mr. Hays seconded the motion.

Mr. Scalzo stated that his only concern is that he doesn't believe in ever decreasing fees. Whenever a backwards step is taken it is almost impossible to go forward in the future.

Chairman Stewart responded that the Board went too far forward and that it impacted visitation. The Board's fees are some of the highest in the country. People are concerned that we are getting too expensive.

Mr. Ream noted that staff have tried not to set fees at parks like Roper whose amenities are less than a park like Patagonia where the popularity and amenities are greater. It used to be that if Lake Havasu went up \$1 everything went up \$1. It got so high at Lake Havasu that, while it's still a great value there, it became a lesser value at a place like Roper Lake. People stopped going, especially those whose income was lower and who used the park regularly. This happened at Roper Lake because staff tried to be consistent across-the-board in that region for the lake parks. Little Roper Lake and its amenities were essentially priced out of the range of the locals who are the closest guests. The snowbirds still come in; they are fine with the pass fee. The locals were not using the park any more. That was a problem. This is an attempt at fixing that problem.

Mr. Porter noted that he was at Roper about two years ago. Even at that time when the Board was in the process of raising rates the Park Manager expressed serious concerns about what that would do to them. They have competition from parks across the border in New Mexico that are similar and have much lower fees. He believes this is probably a good adjustment.

Chairman Stewart added that she's been to many of those parks in New Mexico and other states. Our prices are higher.

The motion carried 5-1, with Mr. Scalzo voting Nay.

Mr. Cordasco noted that there was an outside consultant who assisted staff in setting those fees a few years ago. He asked whether this issue was taken into consideration.

Mr. Ream responded that a matrix and a fee philosophy for setting fees were developed. A park and its amenities are taken through the fee philosophy on a benefits-based scale with the highest rate being for individual benefits (ski or bike lessons) and the lowest being community services provided that are not charged for (use of rest rooms). It took almost two years to bring all of the fees in line. He told the Board at that time that this was the biggest fee change in the agency's history and that he would be back in a year to make needed corrections. The season was too long for the discount season at Fool Hollow Lake. Some of the others were saying staff were giving away the farm with some of the changes that were made. That same fee group meets quarterly to work on fees. There was park policy that said no pets allowed. Camping is one of the few places that one can travel with pets. If he went camping, he would want to take his dogs along. He expects to kennel the dogs when he stays at a nice hotel. Staff were asking people to come out and use the parks; they were showing up with their dogs. The cabins have no cloth in them at all. The mattresses are vinyl, the floors are wood. One cabin at each park is remaining as no pets allowed to accommodate

guests who may have animal allergies. The \$5 fee will allow for any repairs to damages pets may make.

Chairman Stewart discussed Consent Agenda Item 8. She spoke with staff and representatives from Marana. She believes it is in the Board's best interests as well as theirs to table this item in order to put more time into drafting a single document that contains both of the easements to avoid any litigation in the future.

Ms. Hernbrode noted that Marana has been more than helpful on this issue and have done a lot of work. It was her falling back on the job that didn't get the easement written. She apologized to the Board. Marana has kindly allowed staff to have more time to work on it.

Mr. Porter asked if anything significant would be lost.

Chairman Stewart responded negatively. Marana is not starting their project until July. It should be ready either in February or March.

Chairman Stewart tabled Consent Agenda Item #8 until February or March.

D. DISCUSSION ITEMS

3. Presentation by a Representative of the Phoenix Zoo on Difficulties of Engaging Young People in Nature

Mr. Jeff Williamson, Director of the Phoenix Zoo, addressed the Board. He reported that they had a meeting last fall where he gave a talk on an issue the Board and the zoo have been dealing with for about a decade. About 10 years ago they noticed that the tradition of actually seeing wildlife was beginning to fade as a way of engaging children, particularly, in developing positive attitudes and an interest in wildlife. They began investigating as to why that was and began discovering a suite of things that were going on simultaneously. Increasingly, the Phoenix Zoo services about 600,000 children a year. The children they serve are from urban environments. In those urban environments they are actively engaged in structured out-of-school activities. It is proscriptive. They don't have the kind of access to free play that they had a couple of decades ago for a variety, many of which are justified. As a practical matter, the world within which they were forming attitudes, beliefs, and having experiences that formed relationships was very different than it was when he was young.

Mr. Williamson reported that the Phoenix Zoo began delving into that in greater detail. They discovered over the past 4-5 years that not only have children's experiences be removed from natural landscapes, but they are highly influenced by virtual communications – everything from television to cell phones to the internet, etc. Just last year a book was written entitled *The Last Child in the Woods – Nature Deficit Disorder* by Richard Bloove. He confirmed a lot of their suspicions. They found that children are more comfortable in places where there are outlets. A father related an incidence where he took his child down the block for a structured play date and the child went into the house, sat down with his friend who was in front on a large screen TV playing a video game, and picked up the controller. The two children played for 1 hour and 15 minutes without exchanging a word.

Mr. Williamson noted that those things are not theoretical – they are happening. He attended a meeting at Stanford University last year about what constitutes reality. One of the things they cautioned those in an informal learning environment to simply

recognize that the definition of reality for a person who is 5, 10, 15, or 20 years old is a very different definition than what we grew up with. They expect information to be immediate; they expect to influence outcomes through manipulation; and the random happenings that occur in places that are unstructured are not their experience.

Mr. Williamson stated that two years ago, with the help of the Piper Foundation and in consultation with the Barrows Institute and ASU, they carved out about a 2.5 acre playground at the zoo that simply focuses on giving children experiences during early grade development (all the way up to 5 years old) to play in creeks, build with sticks, etc., where there is active engagement in the manipulation of elements in nature that are unstructured and free play. They introduced them to some programs they have called, "Critter Care," caring for something other than self. They help take care of things like chickens, rabbits, dogs, and cats. Then they graduate to programs where they give care to horses and larger animals through a program they call, "Horses Hands." The whole point of all of this is to find ways of engaging children and introducing them to be active participants in caring for elements in the natural world in an effort to start to build a stewardship ethic through involvement and community-building. Last year they received a grant from the Arizona Community Foundation, and working with the Grand Canyon Trust, the Second Chance Shelter in Flagstaff, Tucson Audubon, Arizona Welfare League, and others, are working to test how the school, after school, multigenerational programs that include caring for things within the community as a part of their activity. This has not been going on long enough to have tested the outcomes. He can't say for certain that they are making the kind of difference that they hope to make in the long run. They do believe it is a real challenge that we all face going forward. He exhibits lions and tigers to children. He tries to interpret an African veldt. But he cannot make animals move at will, kill, etc. Literally, two weeks ago there was a group of preteens sitting right in front of the African veldt with an array of animals within 15-20 feet of them. There were eight kids sitting on a bench in front of this either on their cell phones or text messaging. That's the reality that we are dealing with. It's there; it's present. Our challenge is to find ways to compete for these kids' attention, find a way to build their esteem, and create a sense of achievement because they are engaged in their world, engaged in their community, and are caring for something other than themselves.

Mr. Williamson stated that the Phoenix Zoo welcomes participating with the Parks Board and their challenges. In managing public lands, stewardship is a huge issue. From his perspective, they stand ready to work with everyone who wants to partner and try to build a stewardship ethic, particularly with the younger generation.

Chairman Stewart stated her belief that this ties in with something the Board has been dealing with. The Board has noticed that their populations at the parks seem to be increasing in age. They talked about how to get the younger people to the parks – not only the recreation parks but also the historic parks. It has been a real challenge for the Board. A former Board member said that if people don't go to parks when they're young they just don't think about it. That really struck her. The Board needs to put some emphasis into bringing young people in and have something to interest them.

Mr. Hays noted that the parks have nature walks and nature studies for children at Red Rock and other parks.

Mr. Travous responded affirmatively. There is a study out of Texas A&M that talked about the socialization process that happens when children play. Child's play is really work for them – it's really learning social skills. Part of what the agency is facing is that there are fewer places for kids to interact with each other. There's a difference between sitting at a computer and not discussing anything rather than playing a team sport where they learn not just the rules of the game but the rules of fair play as well. That's the social interaction. A part of it is really beyond our control. We are more and more urbanized as a society. His reality is probably similar to Mr. Williamson's. He grew up in a house surrounded by farmland that is now all subdivision. Even Arizona is becoming more and more metropolitan. Some of this is out of the agency's control.

Mr. Williamson noted that they have done a lot of camps, including hikes, etc., for lots of kids. Even hiking and bird watching are considered passive activities now. Attention span is a huge issue. To appreciate wildlife one has to be quiet and still. Motivating that behavior is increasingly difficult.

Chairman Stewart suggested that the parks would be a natural partner for some of those activities.

Mr. Williamson responded that they are looking, in concert with the BLM, at certain areas. There are a number of people who are concerned about these issues and ought to be concerned about these issues for future generations to respect these landscapes.

Mr. Porter stated his belief that it's not as much a problem of urbanization as it is electrification – or electronification. If one goes to rural areas, the kids' world is no longer limited by being in a rural area. Most of the time they don't even know who they are text messaging or where they are. They have a whole different world that we have a hard time even understanding or relating to that's not limited by distance or time elements. They could be talking to someone in China. There's no question that it's a major problem. Even some of the more intelligent of the college students simply, because of how they were raised, can't communicate without sound bytes. They don't want to communicate without sound bytes. They want everything instantaneous; they do not do well in face-to-face discussion or interaction because it's not part of what they had in their realities. How will we excite them with wildlife in a zoo or a nature hike when their idea of excitement is state-of-the-art special effects in the matrix? The parks pale by comparison in their minds and views. The bottom line is that he doesn't have the answers, but it is a major problem.

Chairman Stewart thanked Mr. Williamson for taking time from his busy schedule to meet with the Board today.

2. Presentation by The Nature Conservancy on the Verde River Greenway

The Board viewed a video entitled, *"The Verde River"*.

F. EXECUTIVE SESSION – Upon a public majority vote, the Board may hold an Executive Session which is not open to the public for the following purposes:

1. To discuss or consult with its legal counsel for legal advice on matters listed on this agenda pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03 (A)(3), including:

a. Mabery Easement Dispute Litigation

2. To discuss or consult with its legal counsel in order to consider its position and instruct its attorneys regarding the Board's position regarding contracts that are the subject of negotiations, in pending or contemplated litigation or in settlement discussions conducted in order to avoid or resolve litigation pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03 (A)(4)

- a. Mabery Easement Dispute Litigation

G. ACTION ITEMS FROM EXECUTIVE SESSION

1. Mabery Easement Dispute Litigation

Chairman Stewart noted that this would be a good time to go into Executive Session. She asked if Ms. Hernbrode had any comments prior to going into Executive Session. She noted that there has been some litigation; there's been a ruling by the Court.

Ms. Hernbrode stated that she was pleased to report that neither she nor Mr. Morrow went to jail. The Judge engaged them in discussion about what had occurred and decided that they had not, in fact, been in contempt of court and dismissed that hearing. Their office had retained outside counsel for that hearing. Both Mr. Porter and Mr. Hays attended. At that hearing the Judge also wanted to discuss some of the motions that were on the table at that point. Just yesterday their office received the final Amended Judgment. This is what counsel want to address in the Executive Session.

Mr. Porter made a motion to go into Executive Session.

Chairman Stewart stated that the purpose was for advice of counsel on the Mabery litigation.

Mr. Hays seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. The Parks Board entered Executive Session at 10:50 a.m.

The regular Parks Board meeting reconvened at 11:05 a.m. Mr. Winkleman arrived at the meeting while the Board was in Executive Session at 10:55 a.m.

E. EXECUTIVE STAFF UPDATES

1. Budget, Revenue and Attendance Updates

Mr. Siegwarth gave a PowerPoint presentation, which is included in the Board Book at the end of the Minutes. He reviewed Revenues. He noted concern that the Reservation Surcharge is down and that is of concern. Another concern is the Enhancement Fund. For the first half of the year it is up 2.5%. Because of the lack of rain and other factors, he believes the Enhancement Fund will end up a little over \$9 million. The break-even point is to be up 25% (\$11.3 million). The bottom line is that ASP cannot survive additional break-even target increases and may not survive the current appropriation. It is doubtful the agency can break even in FY06 or FY07 due to increasing revenue targets.

Mr. Scalzo asked what the probability is that the Governor's budget will happen.

Mr. Siegwarth responded that, as shown on the chart in the presentation, there will be a problem. If they don't fix it, they will have to go back and discuss those issues they did not want to discuss last year. He believes the legislature will give the agency enough to

operate and keep the parks open. He believes the Governor's budget does that. There's not much extra in it. He believes there is a very good chance.

Mr. Ziemann added that he also believes that the Governor's budget will keep the agency afloat. It won't do anything else; but at least through the first couple of weeks in November we shouldn't be an issue. His message to legislators has been that they will have to deal with us. We will be an issue for them and they have to fix this or we will be in a situation of having to write bad checks and end up on the front pages of the newspapers. At some point in time they have to address it. The immediate issue is that in order for the legislature to deal with the agency, they have to at least address the Governor's budget. The mechanism for doing that is through an appropriations hearing (a budget hearing) to bring it forward. This agency is not on an agenda; it is not on a Consent Agenda. At this point in time, the JLBC does not want to deal with the agency until they receive a formal letter requesting a Supplemental Appropriation. This is something staff have no interest in doing. Staff are working with the Governor's Office to try to figure out a way to get the agency on an agenda so the process can at least begin. The Governor's proposal will at least get the agency through, while still having to keep fingers crossed that nothing major breaks.

Mr. Cordasco noted that he read the history book on ASP. He thanked staff for getting him a copy. He noted that ASP has been, fortunately, wonderfully resilient. He asked what is different now than in the past.

Mr. Travous responded that staff used to say they were good at pulling rabbits out of the hat. Right now, we're looking for a hat. The agency has been through tough financial times before. The difference this year, particularly, is the forum to discuss the problem. When Mr. Hays was a Senator, there were subcommittee budget chairman from the Natural Resource Committee who would also be on the Appropriations Committee who understood what the agency did and talked to staff about the budget and go to budget meetings. There is no subcommittee chairman any more for appropriations. What used to be a two-hour presentation was reduced to 15 minutes. This year they have a Consent Agenda for the first time, which included a notice that these budgets have already been discussed and consented to. Beyond that, ASP is not even on that agenda. They keep changing the process because they don't want to talk about the problems. They want to look at the budget as a numbers only process and not discuss issues and be confused by the problems those numbers represent. The challenge staff face now is to go to the Governor's Office and get a hearing so people can see what's going on.

Mr. Cordasco noted that with all the adversity ASP faced in the past, it seemed to be combat situations between different groups. Today, it doesn't seem to be that way. Now, with the population growth and the natural resources being the reason people say they are moving to Arizona, there should be a base of support. Yet, this agency can't even get on an agenda for budget hearings. What could ASP do better in this area?

Mr. Hays responded that the alternatives are either neatly lined out and accepted or we go back and request a Supplemental Appropriation. There appears to be no other choice.

Mr. Siegwarth responded that there are some technical things. Normally the Governor does a recommendation and JLBC has it and incorporates it into their budget. When we

have the Governor's proposal, one figures that the JLBC will tie on it and it will be part of the discussion. It doesn't appear that the JLBC had received the Governor's budget when they set the budget hearings. So, staff are not sure now if the agency will be in JLBC's budget or if staff must formally request a Supplemental. That is done through the Governor's Office. The Governor won't know if staff need to write that letter until she sees JLBC's budget. If we're not in their budget, then staff will probably have to write the letter and receive a budget hearing.

Mr. Hays noted that it would be cruel and unusual punishment to make Mr. Travous go over to the legislature and go through what he went through three years ago.

Mr. Travous noted that a letter was sent with the schedule for hearings that said if you aren't on the agenda, the only way to get on the agenda is to ask for a Supplemental. The letter states that smaller agencies will be placed on a Consent Agencies and will not have a hearing – ASP is not even on the Consent Agenda. They will adopt the JLBC recommendation for all Consent Agenda agencies. Any Appropriations Committee member can have an agency pulled from the Consent Agenda. If you disagree with the JLBC recommendations and desire greater scrutiny of your agency budget by the Appropriations Committee, your need to have an Appropriations member request that your budget be pulled and considered. He noted that there is no one over there who even tracks the agency budget on an individual basis – no member of the legislature is assigned to the agency's budget any more.

Mr. Hays asked how communication takes place on an agency's functions (needs and goals) without the subcommittee system and what has taken its place.

Mr. Travous responded that Jay goes to the legislature throughout the year and discusses individual needs with legislators.

Mr. Ziemann explained that a lot of what happens now takes place because he has relationships he has built over the years with a number of legislators. Senator Burns sits in the Senate Appropriations Chair. He doesn't always do what Mr. Ziemann would prefer he do, but he has always been very good about setting aside time to come in and talk to him. He's had ample opportunity, and he has gone through the agency's budget. His message to Senator Burns was exactly what the Board just heard – ASP is going to be an issue. Not doing anything is not an option. ASP is going to run out of money. That is his message to Senator Burns. Senator Burns understands. The most important thing, from Mr. Ziemann's perspective about Tam O'Shanter is that the logical question every legislator wants to know is how to pay for its development. It gives him an opportunity to discuss the budget. He has that opportunity every time he talks about the rock park.

Mr. Ziemann noted that he met with a member of the legislator yesterday who will happily go and pull our budget when the timing is right. In one instance, talking about our budget now is easier than it's ever been. In the past when there have been budget issues, there was always half of the Enhancement Fund sitting. There was always State Lake Improvement Fund to be used for capital. While staff suggest solutions, they have always protected those funds so they could be used as statutorily mandated. Right now there is nothing left to put into the "pot". There is nothing more that they can take. They have taken all of the State Lake Improvement Fund; they have taken all the Enhancement Fund; they have cut our General Fund from \$8.5 million to \$2.3 million.

They tried to take the interest from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and the Governor vetoed that attempt. That's off the table. They won't touch the SLIF grant money that goes to their local constituents. They have been trying for 18 years to take the Heritage Fund and they failed – and the Governor will veto that as well. There is nothing left. The agency is going to run out of money and has nothing left to offer or that they can take. It's much easier to go talk to them. He's not there to threaten them, but they are going to have to deal with this budget. They created this situation and they have to deal with it.

Mr. Hays noted that it is ironic that they are talking about this big surplus; they are going to give us \$0 and we're supposed to live with it. He asked if there is any discussion on whether there is a surplus in the Governor's budget should it pass.

Mr. Travous responded that staff have not seen JLBC's recommendation yet.

Mr. Ziemann added that the surplus is estimated to be between \$850-\$950 million. The legislature is talking about giving at least \$450 million back in tax relief. The Governor is talking about \$100 million. The pay package the legislature is talking about is ultimately 5%-6%; the Governor is talking about 7.5%. Border issues and education are the kinds of things that the Governor is prioritizing. The legislature own sets of priorities. There are a lot of things competing for that surplus. Like employee pay, when times are difficult it is easy for them to say we can't afford that. As with ASP, when times are difficult we can't afford to put money into state parks. However, when times are good there are political things they would rather do with the money and it's easy to ignore ASP then, too. He noted that no one is adamantly opposed to what the agency does. No one with empowered authority has been actively engaged in pushing an agenda to enhance what we do, either.

Chairman Stewart noted that ASP is not #1 on anyone's list.

Mr. Ziemann noted that ASP is #1 on everyone's list when the Board talks about closing parks in their town or community. He is not running down to the legislature and telling them that's what they're facing.

Mr. Cordasco asked again what is different now than in the past.

Mr. Travous responded that there is no conservation push. The system has changed. Right now, we are lacking a conservation push in Arizona.

2. Acquisition Priorities

Chairman Stewart noted that staff provided an updated list of properties. She asked if the State Trust land covered in the Initiative set forth in this document and whether they are the same pieces or if they are parts of larger pieces. It seems as though it might be helpful if it's not broken out now to have them separated out. For example, around KCSP there may be two different pieces that the Board wants and only one was included.

Mr. Ream noted that there are a lot of pieces in and around KCSP that are included in the State Land Trust Reform Initiative (Initiative) that were never on any of the agency's acquisition sights. It is a wildlife or habitat corridor that crosses the State Route 90 and goes all the way to the San Pedro. He's not sure how that showed up. When this acquisitions list was put together, only the two properties on State Route 90 show up.

Those other pieces are not on our list. Those others will be included in the PowerPoint presentation on State Land Trust Reform.

Chairman Stewart stated that it would be helpful in terms of future refinements of this list to identify which properties are included in the Initiative as well as additional lands in the area that the Board may have its eye on. Obviously, it didn't include everything; it includes some things the Board hadn't thought of or asked for.

Chairman Stewart asked how the Board discusses and have input on its top priorities without jeopardizing its ability to get fair prices. The Board has this list; yet it doesn't really give the Board the opportunity to say what its focus is in terms of specific acquisitions.

Mr. Ream noted that except for a portion of the Heritage Fund referred to as A&D (Acquisitions and Development) is natural areas money. The agency does not have any management or operations money under the natural areas money. Staff will be very selective on what would be purchased right now. The priority list would almost vanish. It would have to be a property that is either adjacent to a park and currently part of our Management Plan. Coal Mine Springs would not have been accepted had it not been right next to Sonoita Creek. Or, it would have to be one of those properties that the Board just couldn't let slip through its fingers because it may never come up again in 100 years. In his conversations with other members of Executive Staff, he is hearing that staff need to put together an acquisitions list that is carried over to the legislature for funding because of its great value to ASP and the people of Arizona. He doesn't know where the Board will get any acquisition funds outside of the General Fund. The only other option is the Arizona State Parks Foundation. It gets back to operations and management.

Chairman Stewart stated that she believes we're talking about a couple of different issues. She thinks that one issue is that the Board has to identify its top priorities and then look at the funding options. Those are two different issues. The Board could say it will only look at natural areas right now because that's where it has the money. However, she thinks the Board has an obligation because of a number of parks being in jeopardy in the future if neighbors change. She thinks that the Board has to come up with a strategy. Perhaps the first part is coming up with criteria the Board would look at in terms of evaluation. A certain number of points would be given to something that is critical to the future viability of an existing park. Perhaps coming up with a list of things that doesn't mention specific pieces of land and try to start applying that matrix. The Board has indicated a strong interest in pursuing the Verde River Greenway. Other than that, the Board hasn't really discussed specific acquisitions.

Mr. Ream responded that if any property comes available in the Bridgeport to Tuzigoot area he would be willing to request a special Board meeting to acquire it. Regardless of a matrix, that is something this Board has made quite clear it wants to get accomplished.

Chairman Stewart noted that the Board has not discussed in much detail some of the others and how they involve the parks.

Mr. Ream noted that he went through the document again this morning. Some is new; some is not. This is a Christmas list to a certain extent. The Governor is putting \$100 million into a border protection plan. Perhaps the Border Patrol should buy some

property on the border to use as a headquarters for border protection. There are all kinds of scenarios.

Chairman Stewart stated that she thought good progress was being made. This process of refining the list has been ongoing. Each revision is greatly improved. She believes it's one of those things that there is a tendency to put it off. Some of these properties don't have much time until they are totally out of the Board's ability to acquire. She thinks that the Board really does need to come with a plan over the next year or so.

Mr. Ream added that things pop up all the time. Some of the properties the Board wants haven't popped up yet.

Chairman Stewart noted that she has received letters from people during the last few weeks about the possibility of ASP looking into either managing or acquiring part of the Lost Robley's Archaeological District. She mentioned that to Mr. Winkleman since it is on State Trust Land. It would make an interesting archaeological park along the freeway. It ties in with the Director's idea a while back of having a Native American museum similar to the Heard Museum in Tucson. This might be a great place to have a park and visitor's center. T21 funds could be used. People can see the actual site. With all that traffic between Phoenix and Tucson, it might be viable.

Mr. Travous stated that he was totally unaware of that property.

Chairman Stewart noted that ASP looked into it 10-15 years ago. She just wanted to bring it up today. It might be something the Board might think about having on the agenda when it meets down south in March.

Mr. Winkleman stated he was able to get some information on it. It is a rather large area. He doesn't know how much is on Trust land. Their archaeologist is aware of it.

Chairman Stewart stated the Board's appreciation for all the work staff put into working on that list. It takes a lot of time and effort to put it out.

3. State Land Trust Reform

Mr. Dan Shein gave a PowerPoint presentation on State Land Trust Reform to the Board. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation was distributed to the Board and is included in the Board Book on file in the Phoenix office.

Mr. Scalzo asked how the Pulte development in Benson relates to the parcels of state land.

Mr. Travous responded that the land is across the highway and north of KCSP.

Chairman Stewart asked that the Board's thanks be extended to Mr. Warriner and Mr. Sejkora for their assistance in this presentation.

Mr. Hays stated that he was totally unaware of the actual language when the Board met in Yuma and discussed the proposed Resolution. He, therefore, cast his vote in ignorance for the Resolution in November. Last night he wrote down his thoughts and wished to read them as follows:

"At the November meeting in Yuma, we considered the proposal to change the Constitution of Arizona to manage State Trust Lands. I understood this initiative to be the same as the proposal of the "Fox Group" given to the Legislature last April but not

acted upon due to the lack of time left in the session as well as the enormity of new concepts being proposed. I was also given the impression that there was the same support from all interests concerned that had reached agreement on the Fox Group Report. My greatest personal concern (which I voiced then) was that the power to exchange State Trust Lands was not included in the initiative, as that is the most important tool that Land Commission could have." He would like to see that tool included. It did include, he is happy to say, administrative funding. That is also a tool the Land Commissioner needs. The Board took a vote and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Hays added that since that time he has talked to legislators and last night he had a 30-minute discussion with Mr. Pat Graham, Chairman of the group and he now has a very different opinion; "the proposal is NOT the same as the proposed legislation of last spring. However the portions that would help ASP are still the same as in the Fox Group report and therefore that part is fine with me. It is the bigger picture and its impact on the State Trust that concerns me. I would like to review some of the issues that are so disturbing." He noted that in his discussions with legislators, some of the legislators feel as if they have been bypassed. He continued to explain his concerns as follows.

"First is the statement of purpose (which is the same as "Legislative Intent" on proposed legislation). In future years this is very important to the guidance of the Courts when settling disputes, as it is often the only guideline available. For example the Fox report said 'THE PURPOSE OF THIS PROPOSITION IS TO ENSURE AND INCREASE THE ECONOMIC VALUE OF THE STATE LAND TRUST FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND OTHER BENEFICIARIES WHILE MAXIMIZING LANDS FOR NATURAL OPEN SPACE.' All parties agreed to this wording. Now the statement says: 'THE PURPOSE OF THIS PROPOSITION IS TO PERMIT THE STATE OF ARIZONA TO MANAGE STATE TRUST LANDS IN WAYS THAT PROMOTE WELL-PLANNED GROWTH, CONSERVATION, AND SOUND STEWARDSHIP, ADDRESSING ISSUES THAT WERE NOT OF CONCERN AT THE TIME OF STATEHOOD.' There is no mention here of 'economic benefit' which was the whole point and purpose for creating State Trust Lands for support of education and several other entities. The original wording was the key that gained consensus and support from all interested parties in the Fox group."

"The second point I find disturbing is that the proposal creates a Board of Trustees to oversee the Land Department and set policy. It is made up principally of persons involved with education. They are the beneficiaries of the trust and will be managing the trust. In the real world this would never happen. The board needs people who are experts in the economic world, such as bankers, land developers, mining experts, wildlife managers, range managers, ranchers, as well as educational experts."

"Third, having talking to legislators and leadership, I find that this pretty much bypasses the legislature as nowhere can I find the words, "AS PRESCRIBED BY LAW" except in the section that creates the Board of Trustees. The legislators I talked to feel that this omission is deliberate." And, unless these words are included in the proposition, the legislature cannot fill in the specifics of implementation; it will therefore be done in Court."

"There are many more points that I could discuss in the original working, but I don't want to take up time now. I could go over them, but it is late in the day."

"My point now is that although I voted to support this initiative when we were in Yuma, it is not my view after reading and researching the issue. I do not support it as it has been greatly changed since the Fox report of last April. I would like, for that reason, to go on record. I could make a motion to reconsider our action that was taken in Yuma to endorse this initiative. It would only be then acted upon if the motion receives a second. If not, the motion dies. My point is that I want to be on record as non-supportive as it is written. An issue as important to the future of Trust Land management needs much more open discussion and more clarification." He added that it should, in his opinion, go through the legislative process.

Chairman Stewart responded that she was not involved in this Initiative, as was no one on the Parks Board or staff. She has some concerns as well. Mr. Hays made a statement that concerned her very deeply and that was that he felt he was given the impression that this is the same as the Fox version. The Board had numerous discussions at its meetings – Ms. Boland spoke to the Board; Mr. Winkleman spoke to the Board – and explained very clearly that it was different. The Board discussed some of the differences. She doesn't believe anyone thinks any provision is perfect. The Resolution the Board passed was very carefully worded to emphasize the benefits to ASP. She thinks it clearly is a great benefit to ASP; she thinks that any time one tries to do an Initiative is because the coalition can't be kept together – that's why the Fox version failed.

Chairman Stewart added that any Board member is free to have their opinion. She did, however, take exception with any suggestion that this Initiative was presented as the same as the Fox version because there were numerous discussions on it.

Mr. Hays responded that he was hearing what he wanted to hear. He is not saying anyone deceived him; it is his own fault for being totally ignorant in assuming that the Fox group report would be rewritten as an Initiative. That was his understanding in his mind.

Chairman Stewart stated that there were a number of articles in the newspapers regarding this Initiative.

Mr. Cordasco stated that he wanted to back up Mr. Hays on his feelings. Rather than reiterating what Mr. Hays said, he would like to add to it. First off, one of his concerns is that he never had any input into the meetings that were held in Northern Arizona. He visited with the County people and found that they had no input on it, either. He then went to the Homolovi meeting recently and the Hopis spoke about how they had no participation in the process there. It made him ask the question of who is putting this thing together.

Chairman Stewart responded that it was a very small group.

Mr. Cordasco stated that he then went to that very small group and asked. They didn't want to admit they did it. The fact that no one wants to take ownership is very puzzling. He wonders if the reason no one will take ownership is that they are waiting to see if it's a winner or not. He can appreciate that. However, here are all these people going around telling everyone in Arizona how great this thing is but none of them wants to stand up and tell people that this is one of the most significant changes in the State of Arizona's history. Because no one wants to take a leadership role in this, he has to wonder what the "reform" in this Initiative is. The Board has seen some outstanding

maps and some vision of what it will do. OK, that's great for ASP – and it certainly is. But then we talk about regional planning. How does ASP end up getting to be a part of regional planning? It's not articulated in this Initiative. It just says the agency gets to participate in regional planning. What does that mean?

Mr. Cordasco added that he has one last concern. He asked the Board to appreciate that this is coming from him – he's speaking for himself as Mr. Hays did. He pointed out that when one visits with anyone who was a part of putting this plan together, and he has done his part to do that – and ask them why they left out ranchers they won't tell you. They know that the State Land Department having the ability to do land trades is the number one tool for regional plan – whether it is open space or putting development in appropriate places, protecting our watershed, integrating checkerboard lands. There is not one of them who won't tell you that's not the #1 tool the Land Department needs. It would take guts to do that – to forge that into the Initiative going to the general public and reverse what most of these people involved in it today tried to get rid of in the 1990s. It's the same people. So when the Board says it will come out in support of a proposal that basically comes out and says we can go and buy these lands or get them for free when we can't afford to buy anything and still have to talk about closing parks and can't even get the legislature to fund the agency, he feels like we're talking about a railroad car with the engine behind it. What are we talking about?

Mr. Cordasco stated that when it comes to State Land Reform, he doesn't care what extreme right or left you talk to, there is no one who doesn't think there should be some form of reform. They will all say it's necessary. Then, why that can't that be harnessed?

Mr. Hays added that he spoke last night for half an hour with Mr. Pat Graham, Chairman of the group that put the Initiative together. He respects Mr. Graham very much. Mr. Graham stated to him that it was very, very difficult to try to keep this group sitting around a table from going off in a different tangent. This is the best they could come up with. It was a small group. Mr. Hays appreciates what Mr. Graham tried to do, but he cannot support it for the fact that it didn't have more public input, more hearings throughout the state and discussions throughout the state to inform the public. This has too big an economic impact on the State of Arizona.

Mr. Porter stated that he has been listening and certainly appreciates the comments from both Mr. Hays and Mr. Cordasco. He doesn't believe this Initiative has a chance of passing. He believes that the mere fact that gentlemen such as Mr. Hays and Mr. Cordasco, who are obviously in favor of reform, are obviously not going to support it puts a death knoll to it. The only problem is – Mr. Hays raised the issue – that legislators are whining because they were not included in this group. But they had the opportunity to address this issue in the last session. They dropped the ball. They totally dropped the ball – and they not only dropped the ball, they put it on the ground and jumped up and down on it, stomped it to pieces, and will do the same thing every time it comes back to them. The bottom line is that if it's not done by Initiative and if it's not done in a fashion that freezes the hands of the legislators and passes, they will do just as they've tried with the Heritage Fund and come back and chop it to pieces and use it for their own little petty purposes. That may sound harsh, but he, for one, does not trust our legislators right now. He doesn't think that their motivations are what they should be and he blames that on term limits. People get elected on narrow issues and they really don't have the big picture and don't really understand what they are doing.

Mr. Porter added that he can't really totally disagree with Mr. Hays and Mr. Cordasco. He believes that there are issues there; he just doesn't know where we'll get land reform is we don't get something done quickly. There won't be much left to reform if we don't get on it pretty soon.

Mr. Hays stated that, had they taken the Fox report from last spring as it was presented, and written it into an initiative, everyone would be more able to beat the drums and support it. Another issue is that clarity is not good.

Chairman Stewart responded that the same problems existed with the Fox group. It was a very small group of people. She was not involved in either of these groups. She has some of the same criticisms that have been raised today. There were a number of people who were left out of the dialogue. On the other hand, as a State Parks Board member, she feels she has an obligation to look at this in terms of whether this is good for ASP, and if there are things in it that are damaging to the people of the State of Arizona. When groups like the Arizona Education Association come out in favor of it, that seems to eliminate one of the earlier concerns that maybe this was bad for education. She believes the Board is in a situation where this Initiative isn't how any of the Board members would do it if they were in charge. But, we had Proposition 100 – that failed. We had the Fox group report that frittered out at the last minute. She believes that Mr. Porter makes an excellent point that if we don't get going on something, we won't have to worry about the issue because these lands will all be developed.

Mr. Hays noted that through all his years in the legislature, the Arizona Education Association was not a group whose word he would take for anything without back-up from others. They are not a group – they are a teachers' union – and they have their own specific goals and objectives (and always have had) that aren't necessarily in the best interests of the entire State of Arizona. He was told they were one of the strongest proponents to rewrite the Fox group report into the form that we see today.

Chairman Stewart stated that this is about as far as the Board can go today. The Board has to realize that we are in an imperfect world and faced with some choices that we don't always like to make.

Mr. Hays stated that he wanted to be on record as NOT supporting the Resolution passed by the Board in November 2005.

Chairman Stewart stated Mr. Hays can have whatever statement he wished in the Record; it's not really agendized to make a motion even though the Agenda says the Board might take action on anything.

Mr. Hays responded that he didn't need the Board to take another action on it. He wants it to be very clear in the Record that he now opposes the Resolution passed by the Parks Board in November 2005.

Mr. Travous stated that he would ensure Mr. Hays' change of mind would be reflected in the Record.

Chairman Stewart stated that she had no problem with Mr. Hays; she believes he raised some concerns that all the Board members have. The Board is also looking at how to acquire this. One of the benefits of this Initiative is that it has a lot less in it than any previous document and leaves a lot more to be done by legislation.

Mr. Travous noted that, in his experience teaching public involvement, there is a adage that "People coalesce around problems and disperse at solutions".

Mr. Winkleman noted that this has been a very challenging topic. There has not been a perfect solution proposed. He's been very active in this for three years. There may not be a perfect solution.

Mr. Cordasco asked if Catalina State Park was the last authorized land trade.

Mr. Travous responded that it might have been Red Rock State Park. ASP was on the cusp of the 80 acres of the entry to Oracle State Park (trading it with the Land Department) and within days of perfecting the paperwork the Judge came out with his decree.

Mr. Winkleman noted that he had to leave the Board meeting for another commitment. He reported that during his absence from the meeting this morning the Land Department sold 30 acres for the highest price in the history of the Land Department – more than \$1 million per acre. He noted that prices are going up.

4. Legislation - Update on proposed legislation and committee assignments pertinent to Arizona State Parks

Mr. Ziemann referred to pages 51 and 52 in the Board packet, which listed principle legislators he deals with on an almost daily basis. He distributed his updated "crib noted cheat sheet" for the Board to see some of the bills that have been dropped thus far. There are two weeks remaining before the introduction of bills becomes more problematic. He noted that at last count just under 1,000 bills or pieces of legislation have been introduced. In a typical legislative session there are about 1,100; they will go way beyond that number before they are done this session.

Mr. Ziemann reviewed ASP's bills as follows:

SB 1086 Reservation Surcharge bill – allows that fund to work. It moved yesterday and went through Senate Natural Resources.

HB 2??? AORCC Continuation Bill – has not been introduced yet. It needs a Committee of Reference meeting; there were quorum difficulties.

SB 1??? Rock Climbing State Park – has not been introduced yet. There are issues involved in getting this bill introduced.

Mr. Ziemann discussed two other bills as follows:

HB 2509 Heritage Funds; Encumbrances – allows for Heritage Fund expenditures that G&F or ASP makes to be done over multiple years. The harm of that is that ASP can do that anyway. It doesn't help at all. One might believe that this bill was introduced as a threat by legislators who have been opposed to the Heritage Fund. In fact, it was introduced by legislators who are the agency's friends and been most supportive. This bill is somewhat of a mystery; staff will watch this bill very closely.

HB 2622 OHV; Regulation – It was staff's understanding that Representative Konopnicki and Senator Flake would introduce a bill dealing with the OHV program. This is an issue he has worked on with G&F for the 6-8 months. There was an existing OHV account that brings \$2.2 million to ASP. A new

program was to be established – a sticker program – that would generate additional revenues that G&F would use to run various programs. That was the proposal that was to go to Senator Flake and Representative Konopnicki was going to sign on. Then HB 2622 appeared. This bill does not do what was anticipated. It does not create the new funding account. It takes all of the existing funding and transfers it all to G&F. ASP would lose all OHV funds. The agency currently pays 13 staff out of that fund. There are multiple issues. He will meet with Representative Konopnicki, Senator Flake, and various stakeholders on Monday to see where this bill came from and try to put 2622 to bed and perhaps work the bill through Senator Flake.

Mr. Ziemann noted that, in the big picture, there are a lot of technical correction bills again. HB 2303 deals with our Enhancement Fund and was introduced by the Speaker. There are probably 200 technical correction bills that have been introduced. These are vehicles for striker amendments later in the session. They are assigned to Rules and never get a hearing. They go through the system and suddenly pop up and we don't know what's on them. There is a lot of legislation on employee pay; a lot of issues are legislation on the border; a lot of legislation on condemnation as a result of the recent Supreme Court case (most deal with municipalities; some with counties). The Board does not appear to be targeted. There is a lot of legislation on photo radar.

Mr. Hays asked if they are serious about the session lasting 83-85 days.

Mr. Ziemann responded that they are serious; they are still giving lip service to that estimate. Obviously, that estimate was torpedoed when they introduce 2,000 pieces of legislation to be considered as well as the problems with the budget. Frequently, when there is a huge surplus, the legislative sessions become more contentious than when they have to go in and cut funding. If he were to bet, he would say June – about 150 days rather than 80+.

5. Update on Climbing Park

Mr. Travous reported that there have been several meetings. It now appears that there will be a meeting next week with Senator Flake and members of the Mining Association. Staff have also been invited, along with others, to attend to see if they can get Senator Flake to drop the bill. In the meantime, it appears that they are trying to push the federal bill first. The Mining Association – primarily by Asarco who doesn't want this in their backyard even though it is several miles away – is raising concerns. Resolution Copper has agreed to change where the road goes in, as well as other things. Staff continue to assure the Governor that we are taking a back seat on this even though staff continue to be invited to attend these meetings. Staff are attending meetings they are invited to. It is primarily the people with Resolution Copper who are pushing the bill forward. There is not much more to report on at this time. It appears the federal bill might come more quickly than the state bill.

6. Mt. Lemmon Aerial Tram Feasibility Study Presentation

Mr. Travous reported that the study has been dropped. He was on the study team to look at a tram up Mt. Lemmon. There is some funding by City Council to fund the study, however they will not put any more money into the proposition. For all intents and purposes, it appears to be dead. Should it revive, he will advise the Board.

7. Status of Negotiations with the Arizona Historical Society for an Agreement of Mutual Cooperation

Chairman Stewart noted that the Board received a copy of the draft from Mr. Porter today which appears to cover the things the Board discussed.

Mr. Porter stated that the only reason he drafted an agreement is that he knows that the Director had so many things on his plate as did Ms. Woosley, Director of Arizona Historical Society (AHS). He felt that since he had been pushing for this that he owed it to them to give them an idea as to where he was coming from. A meeting between Mr. Travous and Ms. Woosley was scheduled for the first part of January. Unfortunately, Ms. Woosley is ill. He believes that, using this draft as a base, staff will be able to come back to the Board in February.

Mr. Travous stated that he likes what the draft says and that it is now a matter of meeting with Ms. Woosley when she is up to it.

H. CALL TO THE PUBLIC – Consideration and discussion of comments and complaints from the public. Those wishing to address the Board must register at the door and be recognized by the Chair. It is probable that each presentation will be limited to one person per organization. Action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study or reschedule the matter for further consideration at a later time.

There was no public remaining who wished to address the Board.

I. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Mr. Travous reported that the Board has traditionally followed a order for succession that would provide that Mr. Porter would become the next Chairman with Mr. Cordasco serving as Vice Chairman. He noted that someone other than those two should make the motion.

Board Action

Mr. Hays: I move that Mr. William Porter become the Chairman of the Arizona State Parks Board for the calendar year 2006 and that Mr. William Cordasco become the Vice Chairman of the Arizona State Parks Board for the calendar year 2006.

Ms. Chilton seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Mr. Winkleman excused.

Mr. Porter then took the gavel.

Mr. Travous stated that another tradition is for staff to present an award to someone who has spent the necessary time as the Chairman of the Arizona State Parks Board. He presented Ms. Stewart with a plaque and thanked her, on behalf of staff, for her work over this past year. He asked that it be hung in a place of honor in her home or office.

Chairman Porter stated that his first order of business would be to thank Ms. Stewart. He has served as a volunteer on a number of organizations and has served as chairman of various boards. He has rarely run across someone who has spent as much time and effort to inform herself, learn about the organization, and tried very hard to be able to lead and give direction as Ms. Stewart. She served as chairman during some difficult

times when difficult decisions needed to be made. He believes that Ms. Stewart has given the Board leadership and thanked her.

Mr. Hays noted that he has known Ms. Stewart for many years. He first met her when he was Director of Weights and Measures and she was their attorney. He finds her to be thorough, highly ethical, and true to her beliefs of what is right and what is wrong. He thanked her for her service to the Parks Board.

J. TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING AND CALL FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

1. Staff recommends that the next Arizona State Parks Board Meeting be held in Lake Havasu, AZ on February 16, 2006.

Ms. Hernbrode requested that the February Agenda include a discussion of the Robertson lawsuit. This is the rock-throwing incident at Tonto Natural Bridge State Park and has not yet been presented to the Board. Risk Management is handling the case. This is a case where a woman was injured as a result of someone throwing a rock at the Bridge.

Ms. Hernbrode requested that the Mabery litigation again appear on the Agenda in February.

Mr. Cordasco noted that there was discussion earlier in the meeting regarding a future forum with G&F. He noted that it's not just G&F and ASP, but so many people who are doing the same thing. The leadership is starting to dissolve. When we talked about State Land Reform today the question was asked who "they" are who are supposed to be doing all these things. The Board has instituted PAMS and other visionary ideas to become leaders in this area. The perception of what ASP does needs to be forged and defined to the general public and with all these other groups. This discussion should perhaps be on an Agenda.

Chairman Porter responded that, because he plans to have Mr. Cordasco involved as much as possible this year, perhaps the two of them should have a discussion along the lines of content for the Board retreat that is scheduled for July. That meeting will be a two-day affair where the Board will have the opportunity to take a hard look at some of these things and spend time discussing them. There were a lot of good, meaningful discussions today, but they are time consuming and hard to do in regular meetings. He believes the appropriate place to begin that discussion would be in that session.

Mr. Travous noted that an update on where things stand on the Vision and Design is due in February.

Chairman Porter noted that by the next meeting he and the Director will try very hard to have a finalization on the two meeting sites for March and October. The dates are firm; the location is yet to be determined.

Mr. Cordasco asked if the Chairman would consider beginning the meetings in Southern Arizona at 9:30 or 10:00 a.m. Getting through Phoenix can be difficult for those coming down from the north.

Chairman Porter asked if anyone had a problem with that request. Not hearing any, he stated that it is something that can certainly be taken under consideration.

Chairman Porter noted that he spoke with Mr. Ream this morning regarding planning for the Lake Havasu presentation. He noted that there are some major problems there that need to be addressed. Mr. Ream has been working very hard since the meeting in Lake Havasu. The Chairman is receiving a lot of contact from a lot of people in Lake Havasu. The message is all the same – Thank God you are looking at it. They are afraid. Their Parks Director stated that it is very, very dangerous and that he believes there is a disaster in the making if we don't get some facilities going in up there quickly. The lake is becoming more and more overcrowding. He is very pleased with where Mr. Ream is coming with all this. He believes staff are putting together a good plan. The Board will have to spend some time at the Lake Havasu meeting. He expressed his hope that all of the Board can come.

Ms. Stewart asked if the Board will be able to end at Noon; she needs to be in Yuma for another commitment.

Chairman Porter stated he didn't see a problem. He will try very hard to keep the Agenda as limited as possible to those issues. That's the purpose of meeting at Lake Havasu. It would be good if as many Board members as possible attend the tour and dinner the night before; it is imperative that as many Board members as possible attend the actual meeting on February 16.

Mr. Ream noted that the tour will begin at 3:00 p.m. February 15th at Contact Point. There will be an overview of the land; there will be some photos; many Council members will participate in the tour; some of the developers who are keen on developing a south ramp are expected to be there. He invited the current concessionaire at Lake Havasu to be there. He noted that he has some ideas of what can be done there that are his. There is State Trust Land adjacent to the park that is Permanent Reserve land. There's BLM land there. There will be a lot of things to look at. There will be land use maps; photos of the problem at Lake Havasu; proposed plans; ideas to solve the problem. Everyone wants the south ramp (and for a different reason).

Mr. Ream reiterated that the tour begins at 3:00 p.m. at Contact Point. A dinner with the Board as guests of the City will follow at 6:00 p.m. at the Nautical Inn. Overnight accommodations have been made at the Nautical Inn.

Chairman Porter advised the Board and staff that his behavior changes when he has the gavel. He does not believe in abusing the chair. He has always been bothered by chairmen who do. He has a tendency to try to simply moderate and let the Board do the moving. That means that when motions need to be made, he requested that Board members make them. He will try to keep his involvement in discussions to an absolute minimum. He wants to be a good chair; he wants to be a moderator; he wants the Board to conduct business. His job is to provide the forum and move the Agenda along. He will be aggressive in moving the Agenda. He will push the Board to get things done and move on to the things the Board needs to deal with and get them. He stated his appreciation of the election. He is honored to be walking in the footsteps of those people of just the last few years that he is following.

K. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Cordasco made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Stewart seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 12:50 p.m.

Arizona State Parks Board
Minutes
January 19, 2006

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Arizona State Parks does not discriminate on the basis of a disability regarding admission to public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting the ADA Coordinator, Nicole Armstrong-Best, (602) 542-7152; or TTY (602) 542-4174. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

Elizabeth J. Stewart, Chairman

Kenneth E. Travous, Executive Director